THE New Republic

Congress Should Cut Taxes Now

Editorial

Page 3

Religion at Harvard

To What Values, If Any, Should a Free University Give Allegiance?

By WILLIAM WARREN BARTLEY, III

Hepcats to Hipsters

By WILLIAM RAYMOND SMITH

KLAUS KNORR on DISENGAGEMENT

FRANK GETLEIN on ABRAHAM RATTNER

APRIL 21, 1958

25 cents

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Washington Wire

Last Words

A FINE YOUNG MAN was David Dalrymple Jones. Eisenhower said "Buy!" and Jones bought. It was the thing to do. "Buy anything!" said Eisenhower. "Buy anything!" Jones told his wife. He was counteracting mass discouragement. Fine stuff was Jones! Even when he lost his job and joined the 5.2 million unemployed he kept his Chin Up. As he queued for jobs he was sustained by heartfelt expressions of sympathy voiced at the White House or Augusta. He had no patience with those who noted unemployment had increased in March. "Don't you see the rate is slowing down?" demanded Jones testily.

They repossessed his car and foreclosed his mortgage and Mary and the children went back to her parents, but Jones was of stout heart. He applauded Budget Director Stans' attack on Congress for "turning on vast new programs for spending." Cried Jones—"That's the stuff!" His enthusiasm for Bernard Baruch was unrestrained: "Let us not unbalance the budget," said Jones. "What an estimable young man!" said businessmen to whom he unsuccessfully applied for work. Sleeping in cheap boarding houses, Jones yet found pennies to buy the editorials applauding Eisenhower for rejecting unwise tax cuts.

Yes, a fine young man was David Dalrymple Jones! His last words were (at the hospital where they brought him with acute malnutrition) — "Doctor, keep me going just a little longer. I must vote Republican this fall."

Fighting Words

WHEN EISENHOWER makes a fight for modernizing the Pentagon, he deserves all the support he can get. Consider that our satellite weighs only 31 pounds whereas Moscow now has a launching rocket with a thrust capable of putting a Sputnik of 7,000 pounds in orbit! It was electrifying last week to hear the President promise to go all-out for his program. The great question in everyone's mind is how hard he will fight. It is difficult to put this down without sounding cynical, but Eisenhower is a one-round fighter. He came to office with a copy-book notion of the Presidency. He backed away from controversy with Congress. He would not "get in the gutter" with McCarthy. He took moral credit for not using political tools put there to make a President strong. Eisenhower's heart is in this particular battle; it is one instance at least where he is his own expert. But will he follow through?

Political Gossip

STASSEN will get the GOP governorship nomination in Pennsylvania; Knowland, in California; both men will lose to Democrats. . . . If California Attorney General Edmund G. Brown (D) beats Knowland for the governorship, as now seems likely, Brown will be a Presidential possibility. . . . Brown incidentally is a Catholic as is, of course, Senator John Kennedy (D, Mass.), another Presidential dark horse. . . . Democrats won't talk about it publicly but they see a chance of the religious issue's damaging them in 1960, a loss of some Protestant votes if Kennedy is nominated, of Catholic votes if rejected. . . . Washington sentiment generally is that Kennedy is too young, too inexperienced; it is not beyond possibility that after rejecting Kennedy the Democrats might choose Brown. . . . Much more likely Democrats will pick some colorless compromise figure with a minimum of enemies like N. J. Governor Robert Meyner. . . . Anti-Nixon GOP members now think Defense Secretary McElroy is a possibility. . . . The split among Republicans will handicap them in this year's Congressional election; the split among Democrats (on civil rights) will handicap them in 1960.

Politics are heating up and this final quarter of the 85th Congress will see partisanship accentuated. Take, for example, the extraordinary 108-page report just issued by the staff of the Senate Republican Policy Committee charging that the anti-Communist ADA is offering a "program of laundered Communism" and trying to capture the Democratic Party for "national socialism." The ADA is indignant but rather flattered, too. Nobody has bothered to attack it for some time. The GOP study is prepared under the aegis of Senator Styles Bridges (R, N.H.) but it carries an unusually candid footnote saying that no Republican candidate is responsible "for the statements herein contained, except such as they are willing to endorse and make their own." In other words the GOP supplies the mud, but it's up to the candidates to throw it.

The GOP's radical Right, meanwhile, through the person of Senator William Jenner (Ind.), and a Judiciary Subcommittee, has accepted for publication (and free distribution under frank) a crack-pot attack on the US Supreme Court as an "instrument of global conquest" and unwitting tool of "Communism" because of its civil rights decisions. It's a curious thing to be disseminated by the Senate. It happened because other Senators don't take Jenner's proposal to curb the Court seriously and have pretty well ignored him. This gave his subcommittee counsel, J. G. Sourwine, an opportunity to slip the document into the record for later publication. The House Un-American Activities Committee looks at the feat with envy. Although the internal Communist threat to America has disappeared, Senate and House committees get big annual appropriations to investigate "Reds" and have to produce something.

Seventeen Months To Go

DO YOU REMEMBER the Eisenhower Civil Rights Commission? It was created in the famous right-to-vote law signed last September. It is limited to two years. Yet seven months of its life have now passed and its staff director is still not confirmed. Eisenhower didn't name anyone till Feb. 20. Since then Chairman Eastland (D, Miss.) of the Senate Judiciary Committee has stalled confirmation. And meanwhile Southerners in the House have held up the commission's appropriation.

T.R.B.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The New Republic
A JOURNAL OF OPINION

VOL. 138, NO. 16, ISSUE 2266
APRIL 21, 1958

THE WEEK 3

Tax Cutting Time; The Rape of History; Yarborough's Opponent; Sail On; Ambassador Murphy's Good Offices; What Nasser Wants from Moscow

ARTICLES 8

A Worthwhile Gamble, If . . . by Klaus Knorr

Religion at Harvard by William Warren Bartley, III

BOOKS 18

MOVIES 21

ART 22

GILBERT A. HARRISON, *Editor & Publisher*
MICHAEL STRAIGHT, *Editor-at-Large*
HELEN FULLER, *Managing Editor*
SELIG S. HARRISON, *Associate Editor*
ROBERT EVETT, *Book & Music Editor*
F. R. Ruskin, *Asst. to the Publisher*
Contributing Editors: Alexander M. Bickel, Frank Getlein, B. H. Haggin, Irving Howe, Gerald W. Johnson, James E. King, Jr., Donald Malcolm, Helen Hill Miller

Published weekly (except for omissions of four summer issues) and distributed to newsstands by the Eastern News Company, N. Y. 14, N. Y. Phone: REpublic 7-8656. Entered as second-class matter September 26, 1950, at the post office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Single copy, 25¢; Yearly subscription, $8.00; Foreign, $9.00. Armed Forces personnel or students, $5.00. Subscribers desiring change of address should notify us at least three weeks in advance. Please include both old and new addresses. Copyright, 1958, by Harrison-Blaine, Inc.

Correspondence

► *Judge Kaufman's Rise*

SIRS:

YOUR EDITORIAL "Judge Kaufman's Rise" which appeared in your April 7 issue opens with the sentence "It isn't easy . . . to put one's finger on precisely what is wrong with the prospective promotion of Judge Irving R. Kaufman."

However, it is very easy to indicate

(Continued on page 23)

Tax Cutting Time

IT IS ALL in the way one reads the figures. Before the March statistics on employment and production were known even Harry Truman was inclined to "wait and see" before supporting a tax cut, with its inflationary risks. But after going over the economic indicators with former aides in Washington last week the "retired Missouri farmer" decided that it was time for a $5 billion tax cut (for low and middle income groups) and a big increase in government spending right now.

Reporting on the same March returns, a famous Washington newsletter to businessmen writes this week:

> Despite the optimism of the Eisenhower Administration and regardless of its feeling that emergency action is not yet needed, the cold fact is that the betterment expected by officials at this time has not occurred, and there are no signs of it at any time soon.
> There are no signs that bottom has been reached, or that it's imminent . . . The recession now seems definitely to be adding to itself, like a snowball that gathers layers as it rolls down hill.

Arthur Burns, Mr. Eisenhower's chief economic adviser from 1953 until late 1956, also reads the figures to mean that, "There is no good evidence of the likelihood on an early economic upturn," and he, like Truman, recommends a $5 billion tax cut now, before business and consumer confidence is seriously impaired.

The present Council of Economic Advisers, too, is now privately recommending that the President call for tax cuts before the recession builds up dangerous momentum.

But President Eisenhower, looking at the same figures, told his April 9 press conference that they showed "a pickup in jobs in March and a levelling off of unemployment . . . a slowing up of the recession." And so, "I see no need for emergency action now," including a tax reduction. "I think there is real grounds to hope that we will, one of these days . . . [be] on the upgrade."

Why does the President cling to his optimism? Certainly it can be no more pleasant for him than for the rest of us to think of the 5.2 million families now suffering from unemployment. (Two million are not covered by unemployment insurance at all; another 1.5 million have exhausted all the benefits the law provides—300,000 did so in March alone.)

In the first place, as a "fiscal conservative," Mr. Eisenhower instinctively prefers the daily advice he receives from his trusted, strong-minded advisers, Secretary of the Treasury Anderson and Budget Director Stans. He sincerely believes, with them, that the added spending he has ordered on defense and the new highway and housing programs will improve things significantly. He hopes that, with encouragement, consumers will end their buyer's strike—and is confident that businessmen, on their own, will so alter their prices or products as to make buying more attractive.

The need for such faith and confidence is borne in on the President and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Secretary Anderson and Mr. Stans every time they look at what is happening to the national budget. To men who believe that deficit financing is almost sinful *per se*, the sight is horrifying. Mr. Stans partly described it in an emotional speech to an insurance group at Houston last week: The 1958 deficit is going to be $1.4 billion—or $2 billion—not $400 million as estimated three months ago—and will go to $5-7 billion in 1959, even without a tax cut. A $6-7 billion tax cut on top of this would produce a $13-14 billion deficit in 1959 instead of the balanced budget Eisenhower estimated last January.

In the Eisenhower-Anderson-Stans view, inflation is far more to be feared, in the long run, than the present recession; and according to their economic theory an annual deficit of $13-14 billion would be highly inflationary. Short of an astronomical rise in the May or June unemployment index, therefore, the President cannot be expected to agree to a cut in taxes. Stans made it clear at Houston: "Frantic preoccupation with temporary conditions," he insisted, must not "be allowed to stampede us into hasty, ill-considered action [cutting taxes] which will add unnecessarily to our future burdens [deficit budgets and inflation]."

We do not question the sincerity of this view, or the damage that inflation can do. But we are not persuaded that Mr. Stans knows any more about what the effects of deficit financing are likely to be than many respected economists who disagree with him entirely. Many experts believe that a $13 billion deficit, spent in fighting recession, would cause no serious inflation. We prefer the risk of inflation they admit we run by cutting taxes to the risk of drifting into a major depression by delaying tax cuts too long.

As for the President's confidence (or is it only hope?) that buyers and/or sellers are about to rush to the economy's rescue from the opposite direction, we join the man who is from Missouri. Consumers with money are holding onto it, waiting for prices to drop. The annual Michigan Consumer Finance Survey indicates shaky buyer confidence. Asked to give their estimate of the general economic situation, 60 percent of those questioned early in 1957 thought times were good; only 33 percent thought so early this year, by far the lowest number of optimists ever recorded by the Survey. It may take more than "Buy" from the President to change their minds.

Similarly, on the seller's side. A cliché of this recession is that the law of supply and demand has been repealed. Sales go down, or remain the same, but prices go steadily up. It is now so accepted that basic industries "administer" prices to maintain a given level of profit, regardless of the market, that little notice has been given to the announcement of three major steel companies that they will raise prices, perhaps $8 a ton, by August, although the industry is operating at only 48 percent of capacity. The president of the American Paper and Pulp Association, on Feb. 20, explained in a sentence why it is doubtful that industry can be counted on to act sensibly in its own and the country's interest. "The nation's paper makers," he says, "will be forced to raise prices if operations continue to lag."

Price inflation, it appears, will continue even if taxes are not cut. It may be more serious if they are. We do not minimize the damage inflation can do. But it is incontestable that inflation in a full-employment economy makes better sense and causes less hardship than inflation in an economy with substantial and increasing unemployment.

The way back to full employment is through increased spending. "Buy," advises the President. The promptest way to make that possible for many more people is to cut taxes of low and middle income families.

The Rape of History

WE WERE jerked to attention one morning recently by the following summons to duty, delivered by Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, Chief of Research and Development, US Army:

> History, like a fascinating woman, only bestows her favors on the bold and the strong; never on the bashful or the weak. Let's tighten our belts and set our jaws—all together—not to recede, not to mark time, but with courage and tenacity of purpose to advance those noble causes for which we have struggled and which encompass man's loftiest hopes and ideals for a better world. It could well be our motto: Awake, America, Advance!

Yarborough's Opponent

WILLIAM ARVIS BLAKLEY, one of the two dozen richest men in the country (his personal fortune is estimated at $200 million; he makes do with seven automobiles; his home is an 820-acre farm within the Dallas city limits), repudiating numerous public statements disavowing political ambitions, has announced he will seek nomination in the Texas Democratic primary on July 26 for the Senate seat now held by Ralph Yarborough. Yarborough is expected to announce for re-election shortly before the filing deadline, May 5.

"Conservative" does not describe Blakley; he is a radical of the Right. He was appointed interim Senator in January, 1957, by Ex-Governor Allan Shivers and served four months—until Yarborough, who beat 18 opponents, including Martin Dies an Eisenhower-endorsed Republican, Thad Hutcheson, was elected. Blakley's brief Senate service was undistinguished. He didn't bother to show up, or pair, for many important roll calls;

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on other matters he followed where Sen. Lyndon Johnson led.

Blakley is among the founders of a new movement in Texas—Freedom in Action—whose Creed reads: "There is no Deity save gain and Horatio Alger is his prophet." He followed Shivers and Daniel into the GOP in 1952 and in 1956 he again deserted his party—something Daniel, up for re-election this year, has taken to reminding audiences that even he did not do.

While a man's possessions do not dictate the form of his political beliefs, Blakley's passionate regard for Big Business may have something to do with his commercial affiliations. These include: Braniff International Airways, four insurance companies, a bank and trust company, a $125 million Dallas shopping center, a 173,000-acre ranch in West Texas, an 82,000-acre ranch in New Mexico, a sheaf of oil and gas properties in Texas and California, and other Texas land properties.

Which way will Lyndon Johnson lean in the Yarborough-Blakley contest? Northern and Eastern Democrats prefer Yarborough to Blakley in the Senate, but Texas' Big Rich certainly prefer Blakley. Whose support can Johnson least afford to lose: those with convention influence and delegations in 1960, or home folks with bankrolls? The answer is neither—and the probability is that Senator Johnson will remain aloof until the primary fight is over.

The quips are circulating in Texas bivouacs: After the Blakley announcement, liberals were telling each other about the poor man who asked the rich man:

"If you're so all-fired rich, why ain'tcha smart?"

Sail On and On

WHY DO WE cheer the odyssey of the four Quakers who, disregarding "keep out" orders of the Atomic Energy Commission, have said they will sail on and on until they reach Eniwetok bomb-test site? It is not that they do not listen to reason; it is that they do not hear it. Other voices have their ear. They are our beloved clowns and saints.

But anyone can carry a banner. To make good drama, protest must involve personal risk. The four Quakers are willing to risk death. Admittedly, the government will not permit them to lose their lives, but that will not diminish the force of the Quakers' gesture. Picture the scene as the US Navy and Air Force sweep down upon this small boat, order it to halt, take it in tow and place the four pacifists under arrest. Few will ask whether the AEC has the legal right to bar anyone from a 390,000 square mile zone in the Pacific. The moment will not belong to governments and its decrees. The world will have given its heart without asking why. And it will not have given it to Admiral Strauss.

Ambassador Murphy's "Good Offices"

Paris

EVER since Robert Murphy set foot in Europe in mid-February, hoping to help mediate the conflict between France and Tunisia, skeptics have predicted his mission would fail. For the salient feature of the Franco-Tunisian controversy from the beginning is not that it has been what the French call "a dialogue of the deaf"; it has been a dialogue of the weak. Neither in Paris nor in Tunis are there governments capable of making the concessions that a genuine settlement demands.

It may seem parodoxical to say this at a moment when Félix Gaillard has managed to ride out a storm in the French Assembly and reach the "promised land" of a four-week parliamentary recess. But before granting the French Premier this grace, the right-wing parties of the Assembly securely tied his hands by making it clear that the price of their continued support was a demand to which no Tunisian government could accede—formal assurance of Tunisia's "non-interference" in the Algerian war. As Habib Bourguiba has repeatedly emphasized to Mr. Murphy and to Harold Beeley, the mass sympathy of the Tunisians is bound to be extended to their "Arab brothers" in Algeria as long as the war there continues. And to disown the Algerian revolt publicly would be political suicide for any Tunisian leader.

For the phrase "non-interference" to have any meaning, it would be necessary to seal the Tunisian-Algerian border hermetically, so that neither arms nor men could penetrate Algeria from Tunisia. This would be an almost crippling blow to the rebellion in Algeria. No one knows it better than the Algerian rebel leaders in Tunis, who have exerted heavy pressure on Bourguiba to oppose any effective international or NATO supervision of the Tunisian side of the border. And since Bourguiba's national army is outnumbered by the rebel forces in Tunisia by at least 3 to 1, this is a pressure that he can hardly resist.

☆

Twice within the last six months Washington has been asked to take steps to strengthen the governments in Tunis and Paris, presumably so that each could be made secure enough to permit concessions to the other. In both cases it has responded hastily in a manner which has made present efforts at mediation more difficult than ever.

The first of these occasions arose last November, when Bourguiba appealed to Washington for arms. Our response was a decision—taken in concert with London—to rush Bourguiba a few thousand rifles and machine guns to strengthen his under-armed Pretorian Guard. (Earlier

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Tunisian appeals to the French Defense Ministry had fallen on deaf ears.) It was felt in Washington and London that if Bourguiba were refused, he would either turn to Russia for arms or be turned out of office by the bayonets of the rebels the moment he resisted their demands.

Our decision now appears to have been a mistake. To begin with, neither Washington nor London anticipated the violence of the French reaction to the shipment of American arms, limited though it was. It confirmed the French in a suspicion which US behavior during the Suez crisis had done so much to strengthen and which is far more widespread in France today than most Americans realize: the suspicion that America wants to get France out of Africa as Britain engineered France's eviction from the Near East in the years 1943-1945.

☆

In the second place, Washington's decision was mistaken in assuming that in some mysterious way the arms we shipped would, because of the guarantees given, be used solely to protect the Tunisian government against the Algerian *fellaga* who were then invading Tunisia in large numbers. But as recent events have proved, the arms have been used by Tunisian National Guards to harass French garrisons bottled up in their camps and to provide safe conduct for the arms caravans, destined for Algeria, travelling overland from Egypt through Libya. In shipping arms to Tunis to counterbalance the arms in the hands of the Algerian rebels, what we have emphasized is our inability, or more precisely, our unwillingness, to keep arms to the Middle East from seeping into the Maghreb. This is a crux of the North African problem today, and it is one to which Mr. Murphy's mission was not directed.

Moreover, in shipping guns to Bourguiba, Washington and London acted unilaterally. No attempt was made to consult other NATO members, even though it was clearly a NATO problem. (Article 6 of the North Atlantic Treaty specifically extends its provisions to France's North African territories.) It was, in effect, an expression of non-confidence in NATO and of the same order as the British and French unilateral action at Suez.

In January, two months after the decision to rush American arms to Tunisia, M. Jean Monnet flew to the United States to plead for a loan on behalf of his former aide, Félix Gaillard. Using his formidable powers of persuasion, M. Monnet impressed the President and Mr. Dulles with the hideous prospects looming immediately ahead if the French Government were to go bankrupt—social chaos, a pre-revolutionary situation, the coming to power of a Popular Front Government or of General de Gaulle, either of which would mean the end of the budding European movement. Once again an urgent appeal caught Washington flat-footed. Once again the Eisenhower Administration was panicked into a decision. The result was our agreement to underwrite a $650 million loan to France.

There is a cruel irony in the fact that it was this generous, not to say extravagant, gesture which has made Mr. Murphy's mission so onerous. For by granting the French Government a handsome loan at that time we inadvertently undermined whatever influence or pressure we might have hoped to exert on France in the next few months in favor of a North African settlement. We took this step out of respect for France's reiterated insistence that *"l'Algérie, c'est la France"* and therefore nobody else's business. But 10 days after M. Monnet's return to Paris, the French Air Force bombarded a Tunisian border village and knocked this contention into a cocked hat.

Just how unprepared Washington has been all along to tackle the North African problem may be seen even more clearly by our behavior at last December's NATO conference in Paris. This conference was held for the announced purpose of recementing the shaken Atlantic Alliance. Inasmuch as the Algerian war has diverted all but two of France's 14 divisions from Europe to North Africa, it might have been expected that the assembled delegations would devote some discussion to a phenomenon which has done as much to shake the foundations of NATO as Russia's Sputniks. Instead, the 14 participating countries agreed to leave North Africa out of their deliberations. Not only that: they extended this veto to the entire Middle East. Thus when Giuseppe Pella, the Italian Foreign Minister, turned up with an ambitious design aimed at formulating a joint NATO policy for the Middle East, the other NATO delegations hastily joined in kicking it under the rug.

☆

This, in the final analysis, is the reason for the preordained barrenness of Mr. Murphy's mission. Mr. Murphy was sent to Europe without any clear assignment. This is not just an accidental aberration, but a repetition of a pattern which has become distressingly familiar. When anything goes wrong in the world, the Administration is tempted to believe that things can be set right by sending out a good will ambassador who will charm the conflicting parties back into benevolence and concord. (Certain French papers have begun referring to Mr. Murphy as *"Monsieur Sourire."*) This attitude—it cannot be called a policy—deserves to be called the Dale Carnegie approach to power politics. In this respect Mr. Murphy's mission belongs in the same class with Eric Johnson's pilgrimages to the Middle East. The comparison may be slightly exaggerated, for Mr. Johnson did have a plan to offer on his repeated trips, whereas Mr. Murphy, if he has had a plan, has painstakingly kept it under his felt hat. His mission has perhaps been the purest example we have yet been offered of public relations as a substitute for foreign policy.

CURTIS CATE

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What Nasser Wants from Moscow

Beirut

THE FORTHCOMING visit to Moscow of President Nasser —doubtless lean and hungry after the long fast of Ramadan—bodes ill for the West. Some commentators, putting a good face on it, have attempted to believe that Nasser's main object in going to Moscow is to get satisfaction on points in dispute between the Soviet and Egyptian Governments: such as tangled trade relations or the eclipse of the Syrian Communists. Such attempts have a strained look about them. National leaders do not usually accept invitations to foreign capitals in order to pick quarrels; more often they go to confirm agreements already worked out in principle. Soviet-Egyptian trade certainly suffers from growing pains; yet Egypt would be a great deal worse off without it. As for the Syrian Communists and their famous grievances under the new deal, when has the Soviet Government in recent history sacrificed Russian national interests to help a foreign Communist Party?

The Arab world is caught up in the Cold War, and its attitude toward the Soviet Union is determined—not in a vacuum—but by consideration of many factors of which the most important is the West's attitude to the Arabs. In such a context, Egyptian differences with the Soviet Union lose much of their significance. They must be weighed against Western support of Israel, the French war in Algeria, British control of Arab lands in the Arabian peninsula, and a growing suspicion that the Americans, for fear of losing British and French support in NATO, are not only failing to check colonialism, but are developing colonialist tendencies themselves. Arabs profess to see such tendencies in American support of the Baghdad Pact, recently underlined by Mr. Dulles' visit to Ankara, and of the British-created kingdom of Jordan; also in the unhidden attempts to build up King Saud as an Arab champion of the West—attempts which contributed so largely to his undoing. Even in the economic field Soviet differences with Egypt weigh less than Western blocking of Egyptian balances and the continued failure to resolve the claims and counterclaims arising out of the Anglo-French attack on Egypt. While British and French trade with Egypt and Syria ground to a halt from which it is only now partially and painfully recovering, the Communist bloc, starting from nothing, was becoming an active partner both as buyer and supplier.

Mention has recently been made of a Soviet "master-plan" for the Middle East. The existence of the plan was first mentioned by Mr. Joseph Alsop many months ago; and he has returned to the theme once more, calling it "the problem of the promise." The promise was a Soviet undertaking to lend full support to the Arab demand for a return of Israel to the frontiers proposed by the United Nations in 1947—"which is a demand for the dismemberment of existing Israel." But, in the view of Mr. Alsop, Israel would not be the main Soviet target; the more deadly thrust would be directed against the pro-Western Arab Governments of Iraq and Jordan. These have hitherto justified their Western affiliations to their peoples by reference to the greater danger from the North. If the Soviets consistently supported the universal Arab demand for the dismemberment of Israel such a justification would be much more difficult to sustain.

Evidence for the existence of this "master plan" is shadowy; but, in the opinion of the present writer, there is nothing unplausible about it, except perhaps the dramatic manner of its presentation. Indeed, it is possible to argue that the plan has already been put into operation by stages; first with the supply of Soviet arms to Egypt, then with Marshal Bulganin's threat to unleash volunteers at the time of the Suez war, and then again with the tightening of economic and financial links with both Egypt and Syria. What could be a more logical development of these opening gambits than all-out Soviet support for the Arab line on Palestine? What is the Soviet Government waiting for?

It seems likely that the Soviet Government was waiting for a decisive shift in its favor of the balance of power inside the Arab world. Last April, a decision seemed near. Nasser had all but snatched Jordan, when King Hussein snatched it back. Since then there has been a state of uneasy equilibrium: Egypt and Syria on one side, Iraq and Jordan on the other, with the Lebanon and Saudi Arabia wobbling rudderless between them. It is true that the equilibrium was weighted in favor of Egypt, but not decisively. A major change in Saudi Arabia now seems likely to confirm the Egyptian advantage. King Saud has been constrained, partly by public opinion and partly by the backfire of a serious personal indiscretion, to hand over power to the Crown Prince, Faisal. The Saudi middle classes, who mold the opinion that brought Prince Faisal to power, are strongly influenced by Nasserism. They expect two things of the new ruler: a clean-up of the Royal finances and a return to pro-Egyptian policies.

THE first results of Saudi Arabia's new course are being felt in Jordan. Even before Prince Faisal came to power, the Saudi Government decided, on grounds of its own financial stringency, to stop the £5 million annual subsidy in Jordan. We should very shortly have confirmation of reports that Saudi troops in Jordan are already on the move back home. The young king of Jordan has leaned heavily on King Saud since the *coup d'etat* of last April; the loss of his support will be felt, and not only in Jordan. For since the formation of the Hashemite Federation, Iraq is now committed to the support of Jordan; and the withdrawal of Saudi support must make the burden heavier than was anticipated by the Iraqi Government when the federation was decided.

Has the moment come, then, for putting the "master plan" into operation? Who knows? If the promise was made to Nasser, he will certainly refer to it during his forthcoming visit to Moscow and point to the favorable omens. "One more heave," said an enthusiastic Palestinian the other day, "and the Hashemites are finished!" A Soviet decision in this sense would give Nasser yet another triumph with which to dazzle the Arabs. It would also make the Western approach to Middle Eastern problems at a Summit Conference infinitely more difficult.

H. A. R. PHILBY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Disengagement Debate

A Worthwhile Gamble, *If* . . .

by KLAUS KNORR

DENIS HEALEY'S brilliant series of articles on disengagement (*NR*, March 17, 24, 31) is by far the most thoughtful and, for operational purposes, most clearly developed treatment of this suddenly so modish subject. Unlike others, he appeals to the mind as well as to a mood. His analysis deserves and will repay close attention by the official makers of policy as well as by the non-official public. I have no hesitation in saying that, if we want to negotiate with the Russians on this range of problems, here is the basis of a realistic position for the West.

And yet, persuasive as it is, the Healey case provokes doubts which it is not his, but the commentators', business to express. My own contribution must necessarily be selective. Thus, I will offer no observations on Mr. Healey's underlying assumptions except to say, in passing, that one need not expect, as Mr. Healey does, the continuation of the present Cold War, whatever its burdens and dangers, to lead to economic ruin and political collapse in the United States and Soviet Russia; and that, if a student of affairs as experienced as Mr. Healey comes to this novel conclusion, he should give some reasons for the prediction. Moreover, the creation of a fully disengaged zone in Central Europe would not seem to lessen the arms burden, or to lessen it appreciably, unless this step results eventually in general disarmament—a prospect which appears slight and could, even under Mr. Healey's assumptions, materialize only in the remote future.

What I want to concentrate on, however, is a confrontation of the advantages and disadvantages which Mr. Healey's scheme presents to the West. Mr. Healey rightly insists that the success of the plan depends on equal concessions by Russia and the West; for, except under the view that Russian reluctance to disengage is caused by a mistaken fear of Western aggressiveness, there is hardly a chance for genuine disengagement if the West must pay the USSR for being cooperative. But either side will base its decision on disengagement not so much on the formal equality of prescribed moves—*e.g.*, troop withdrawal—as on a comparison of the advantages and disadvantages it expects to derive from the execution of the plan.

Should the Healey scheme be adopted and completed—in the sense that the disengaged zone is militarily neutralized, inspected and controlled, and entirely evacuated by NATO and Soviet troops—Mr. Healey expects the following advantages to accrue to the West. (1) Completion of the plan would remove a highly unstable situation in which, for example, in the event of another uprising in East Germany, military conflict might suddenly flare up and, more or less inadvertently, end in a total thermonuclear war of destruction. (2) With the exit of the Red Army from East Germany, Poland and Czechoslovakia, the Pankow regime would almost certainly collapse, Germany would be reunited in a democratic state, and the other satellites, though probably remaining dedicated to broad Communist principles, would rapidly evolve toward greater political independence and acquire more political liberties than they now enjoy. (3) It would offer a pilot project for cooperative arms inspection and control, making both sides more familiar with, and less afraid of, the consequences of inspection systems. (4) No "fourth country" would be allowed to arise in the neutralized area. (5) The danger of surprise attack and, with it, the dangerous temptation in a crisis to start all-out war in order to obtain the advantages of the first blow would be diminished (but only somewhat) by extending each side's early warning line to the far frontier of the disengaged zone, and apparently also by permitting mutual air inspection in a 500-mile belt beyond each frontier. (6) Should Russia commit aggression against the neutralized zone, NATO resistance could start near the Soviet boundary instead of in central Germany. (7) NATO, depicted as a disintegrating compact, would gain a new and popular role and hence a new lease on life. (8) The completed scheme would change the climate of the Cold War to an extent that disengagement would become epidemic and eventually lead to effective disarmament.

Mr. Healey is less explicit and less comprehensive in pointing out the drawbacks of the completed scheme to the West. The main disadvantages, it seems to me, are three. First, withdrawing NATO forces from West Germany would in all likelihood mean withdrawing the

---

KLAUS KNORR, *author of* The War Potential of Nations, *is Professor of Public and International Affairs at Princeton. Next week* EDWARD L. KATZENBACH, JR., *Director of the Harvard Defense Studies Program, will continue our discussion of disengagement.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

British Rhine Army from the continent and the American forces from Europe altogether. I fail to see how these forces, at present the core of NATO strength, could be accommodated in France and the Low Countries. (Incidentally, to provide equivalent forces with the degree of mobility needed for an instantaneous return to the continent would obviously involve very large expenditures.) Second, in the event that the Red Army invaded the neutralized zone, the West would surely have to resort to nuclear airpower if it wanted to make its military response effective. But, inasmuch as Mr. Healey refers to European doubts about the future readiness of the United States to protect its NATO allies with its thermonuclear retaliatory power when all-out war would entail unacceptable losses to the United States itself, it seems even more doubtful that the West would accept such losses for the sake of defending the integrity of the neutralized zone—of Poland, for instance. Could Britain or France be counted upon for such a vigorous reaction? And, once the Kremlin makes the same calculation, the power of the West to deter such a Soviet attack is surely weaker than is its present power to deter a Soviet irruption into West Germany. Third, the appearance of successful disengagement might lead to a far greater relaxation of military effort in the West than in Soviet Russia.

To compare these advantages and disadvantages is obviously difficult, and inevitably tentative and tenuous, since they are in the nature of predictions; and predictions of this kind are notoriously fallible. Nevertheless, the possible advantages to the West would be, *in toto*, of immense consequence. It is my view that the establishment of Mr. Healey's fully disengaged zone would be a worthwhile gamble for the West, provided the United States at least does not relax its defensive effort prematurely and makes it clear to the Soviet leaders that invasion of the zone would meet effective resistance.

However, a plan which is on balance so attractive to the West may well look like a poor bargain to Moscow. After all, the most momentous consequence of the completed scheme would be an unprecedented roll-back of the Soviet empire, at least to the extent that the cohesion of the Bloc rests on Soviet military power. In view of the recent events in Hungary and Poland, it is hard to see why the Soviet leaders should accept such a plan unless, as Mr. Healey himself infers, they are disposed to tolerate a peaceful devolution of the Bloc in order to gain the benefit of lessening the risk of a thermonuclear war of mutual destruction. Mr. Healey is right in saying that, even if they value disengagement highly for this prime reason, they will not agree to the plan as long as they have any intention of later returning to the area by force in order to recover control. That the Russians value the objective of reducing the dangerous tensions enough to give up voluntarily their hold on the satellites, particularly East Germany, is hard to believe. If this disbelief is well based, they will reject the Healey plan outright in its present form or—and this is Mr. Healey's assumption—they will not now agree to total evacuation of the satellite countries.

But if the realistic prospect is that the plan would be accepted but not fully completed, if—instead of total evacuation by NATO and Soviet troops from the "disengaged" area—there would be only a thinning-out of these forces, then it would seem to offer only minor and doubtful advantages to the West. It is doubtful that much would remain of the potential advantages contemplated above under (3), (4), (5), and (8); and any prospect of reaping the vital benefits under (1), (2), and (6) would seem to vanish. Especially, Germany would not be reunited and the military hold of the USSR on the satellites would not be appreciably decreased. And, if it is argued that any disengagement agreement would reinforce anti-Soviet forces in East Germany and Poland, it is far from certain that this is to be desired by the West. A partial disengagement, though more symbolic than real, might raise political tempers in Eastern Europe to the point of explosion and thus increase the very danger of instability which Mr. Healey wishes to remove.

While the consummation of only the initial stages of the plan fails to promise the advantages that might accrue from its full execution, some of the attendant disadvantages to the West would seem to remain. I have already mentioned that the dangerous risks of basic instability would endure. In negotiating the agreement, it might also be difficult for the West to refrain from recognizing and giving legal sanction to the Pankow regime, in particular, and to the *status quo* in Eastern Europe, in general—a factor which might be registered in Poland and Hungary as foreclosing any future opportunity for shaking off, or at least loosening, Soviet control. Also, a thinning-out of NATO forces in West Germany would mean a weakening of American and British strength on the continent. Finally, the appearance of disengagement might still further undermine the frail willingness of Western European nations to provide for their external security. Given the current mood to disengage, indeed, there is a real danger that Western negotiators would be pressed to make unrequited or unequal concessions.

I am sure that there are rebuttals to my doubts and answers to my questions. But it seems indispensable that these doubts be assessed before the Healey plan is given the green light. We better go through a complete "countdown" before launching it. One matter, however, demands the most urgent attention. Instead of giving the world the impression of being rigid, single-minded, and perhaps "scared stiff" in our foreign policy, we should settle down to the business of being enterprising, and displaying initiative and imagination. Our reputation would be better if we had some Healeys on this side of the Atlantic.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Religion at Harvard

To what values, if any, should a free university be committed in a world split by rival doctrines?

by WILLIAM WARREN BARTLEY, III

"THE DEATHBED *of Paganism*," wrote Santayana in 1900, "*was surrounded by doctors. Some, the Stoics, advised a conversion into pantheism (with an allegorical interpretation of mythology to serve the purposes of edification). . . . But these doctors had no knowledge of the patient's natural constitution; their medicines, prescribed with the best intentions, were in truth poisons and only hastened the inevitable end. . . .*"

Those who enjoy "historical parallels" have been pleased to find that current Christendom's chief theologian, Harvard Professor Paul Tillich, calls himself a *healer* of diseased Christian concepts.

Although it is hard to diagnose whether Harvard University's present religiosity and renewed interest in Christian concepts represent a real "revival" or only the final rallying of a mortally-ill thing, one should scrutinize closely the prescriptions Tillich and others have offered to cure the ills of our universities and the world. It may be that organized religion's disease is fatal and the medicine futile, save as a way of minimizing the pain of parting with a lovely thing. Be that as it may, let us see how good the doctors are.

On November 10, 1951, writing in the *Alumni Bulletin,* President Emeritus James Bryant Conant called President Eliot "the spokesman for the modern version of Harvard's religious tradition," and quoted at length the late president's 1909 speech on "The Religion of the Future." "What better statement can there be," asked Conant, "of Harvard's ideal contribution to the religious education alike of the Protestant, the Catholic, and the Jew? . . . These words are as relevant today as when they were uttered nearly 50 years ago."

Less than two years later, delivering his first University address before the Annual Convocation of the Harvard Divinity School on September 30, 1953, newly-elected President Nathan Marsh Pusey turned once again to President Eliot's speech. Characterizing his earlier predecessor as a believer in a "religion that placed its greatest reliance on increased knowledge and good works," Pusey argued that Eliot's faith "will not do for us, if for no other reason, because events of the 20th Century have made its easy optimism unpalatable." This disagreement between President Emeritus Conant and President Pusey set the stage for the "religious revival" that has occurred at Harvard since 1953.

Certainly there has been a resurgence in religious discussion and activity at Harvard since President Pusey's arrival. The spring before his election, the endowment of the Divinity School was $1 million; its Dean was over 70 years old; and more than two-thirds of the faculty were about to retire. The quality of the student body was a joke throughout the University. The most important theological controversy among them that year—dubbed the "piety controversy"—arose when the president of the Student Association, pleading for more "religious interest" among the members, proposed that association meetings be opened with prayer. The physical condition of the school mirrored its intellectual lacklustre: the lawn —unmown and high with weeds—added to the run-down appearance of Gothic Andover Hall, and the organ in the dusty, rarely-used chapel was badly out of tune.

Today the school's endowment is $7 million. The faculty—now multiplied by six—probably forms the most distinguished group of theologians in the world. Former rivals Union Theological Seminary, Yale Divinity School, and University of Chicago Federated Theological Faculty cannot match a roster which lists Tillich, Ulich, Horton, R. R. Niebuhr, Nock, Buttrick, Wilder,

---

This article by WILLIAM WARREN BARTLEY, III, *a second-year Harvard graduate student and holder of the Danforth and Woods Fellowship in Philosophy, appeared at somewhat greater length in the March 28 issue of* The Harvard Crimson. *To Mr. Bartley's criticism of his position that religion should serve as a unifying force in higher education, President Pusey responded last week that "Harvard's historic tradition has been a Christian tradition."*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"This semi-religious [Soviet] philosophy has been corrected and refined by several generations of thinkers, including Marx and Lenin. . . . What do we have in the West corresponding to this great overarching structure of ideas? What integrating view of the world now guides our Western life and policy? . . . There is none!" JOHN D. WILD, Professor of Philosophy

G. H. Williams, Dillenberger, Stendahl, Sir H. A. R. Gibb, Wolfson, Adams, Lehmann, Florovsky, Frye, Cross, Hofmann and others. Admission applications have soared, and no one is any longer ashamed of the student body; nor is anyone enthusiastic about it. More than $100,000 was spent on Andover Hall repairs last year, and substantial additional improvements have been made in the school's other buildings: The Semitic Museum, Jewett House, and Divinity Hall.

There are, of course, some echoes from the past. The students were still fighting over prayer this year—though the battle had a somewhat different bent. Condemning the "vicious practice of using prayers to deliver sermons" in the now daily morning service in Andover Chapel, the Worship Committee adopted a set worship service for Advent Season. And the Chapel organ is still a bit out of tune.

There has been new activity on the college level too. In the period from the end of World War II to 1952, Memorial Church was rarely more than one quarter full on Sunday mornings and the annual reports of the Chairman of the Board of Preachers were regularly on the defensive. In 1950, for instance, after noting that many had urged him to adopt more spectacular techniques to draw larger crowds to the services, the late Dean of the Divinity School, Willard L. Sperry, wrote,

> Churches in general often employ rather spectacular devices to re-enthuse regular worshippers and to attract new worshippers. . . . One is reminded of William James' footnote on these matters, "A Church which has to be run on oysters, ice cream and fun is in a bad way."

Since the arrival of the Rev. George A. Buttrick three years ago, one has had to come early to the Sunday morning services to get a good seat. The stimulating kind of sermon which weekly filled Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church in New York City and which led *Life* magazine to name Buttrick "one of the nation's 10 best preachers" has worked its magic at Memorial Church, crowding the pews with an enthusiastic audience. The charming preacher has also won the students' respect and friendship by becoming teacher and counselor throughout the week, and inviting them to regular tea-time parties at his Brattle Street home for chocolate syrup and ice-cream.

Buttrick repeatedly emphasizes to his guests that he is concerned only to make Christianity—again in William James' words—a "live option." "We would never think of using coercion," Buttrick stresses, "after all, when you're forced to do something, it's no longer any fun."

Harvard's wider community began to notice the change too, and President Pusey's portrait—with a picture of the Memorial Church spire in the background—soon appeared on the covers both of *Newsweek* and *Time.* (President Conant has never been able to do better than a Veritas shield and some ivy on a *Time* cover.) Noting a college chaplain's story about the student who rushed into his office and exclaimed, "Sir, I am at the end of my rope. I have now lost my faith in science, and I gave up religion long ago! What am I to do?" *Time* concluded that a whole generation "has found an urgent desire to believe." Across Broadway, at the *Newsweek* offices, religious developments at Harvard were said to be "like the lifting of a veil"—although some misfits in the Philosophy Department were heard to mutter that the word should have been "lowering."

And finally, last June, after decades of "secular" Commencement speeches, not one, but two, of the student addresses discussed religion. The Latin Dissertation, *De Falsis Philosophis,* derided the existentialists, while one of the English speeches urged a "Revival in Depth." Whatever one's convictions, it was hard to avoid the conclusion that—on Harvard's surface at least—the hair shirt had at last become button-down.

Non-Sectarian Hospitality

Such events and changes were well-publicized. They were, after all, good for public relations and for fund drives. Unpublicized outside the University community —although a discussion of them ran for weeks in *The Harvard Crimson*—was a series of events at Phillips Brooks House, the college's Social Service activities center. In the fall of 1954, Cornelius D. Hastie, '52, then graduate secretary of Phillips Brooks House and student at the Episcopal Theological School, proposed "once again to be true to the total purposes of Phillips Brooks House and its endowments" and to return "piety" to PBH. In order to do this—despite the vigorous opposition of the PBH cabinet—Hastie proposed to install three religious administrators at Brooks House, and to offer them limited use of endowment funds and office space. Except for common financial control, the House

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would have been divided then into four groups: Roman Catholics, Protestants, Jews, and social workers.

Campaigning vigorously against Hastie's plan, the *Crimson* argued editorially,

> The spirit of piety does not demand that undergraduates be tagged as "Protestants," "Jews," or "Seculars." . . . Organized religion did not come to Phillips Brooks House looking for either endowments or office space. Hastie sought them out and offered it to them. That most of them were not enthusiastic over his plans is ample proof that Hastie is seeking to inject religion into PBH for its own sake, not because Brooks House needs religion or because religion needs PBH.

Within two weeks, former officers of the Association had joined in a round criticism of Hastie's move, and members of the cabinet were meeting in executive session to consider constitutional amendments to limit the powers of the graduate secretary. Finally, on October 29, Hastie withdrew his invitation to the three religious groups.

Hastie's proposals had been openly discussed, criticized, and defeated within the Harvard community. Another hasty change, however, was made more skillfully and quite silently by the gracious pastor of Memorial Church.

To Each His Own

For years it had been a tradition at Memorial Church —which had been dedicated on Armistice Day, 1932, to commemorate the Harvard men of all faiths who had died in World War I—that any student might be married there, and many couples, including some Jewish ones, had sought out the Church's Appleton Chapel to exchange their vows. The inter-faith use of the building seemed only natural. Daily chapel services had been abandoned in 1886 and President Eliot and his successors had made clear their intention not to allow any particular religious group to gain dominant influence in the University. Dean Delmar Leighton had noted in a 1952 chapel talk that "If one understands religion to mean adherence to dogmas, ceremonies, and observances set by recognized religious authorities, Harvard is obviously not a religious place." Even President Pusey, in his 1957 Baccalaureate Address, had stated,

> The people who are speaking for religion in universities today should not be understood as speaking in favor of a particular church. They are not asking for special privilege. . . . They are neither trying to move the world backwards, nor are they pleading for special benefits for a particular group of people within society.

In 1955, however, Professor Buttrick refused to permit a Jewish student to be married in Memorial Church by a Rabbi. Last month he re-affirmed the "Protestant-Christian" tradition of the church and his conviction that "it would be intellectually dishonest for Christian and Jewish marriages to be carried on beneath the same roof." Deploring the use of shifting altars at MIT's chapel, Buttrick praised Brandeis University's decision to build three separate chapels. Acknowledging that there should be some official place at Harvard where Jews might marry and worship, Buttrick suggested that a synagogue be built—"at the initiative of the Hebrew Community"—on University property in the Yard. As an indication of his own tolerant spirit he said he would ask to be allowed to contribute the "first $100" toward the building.

During the past week President Pusey lent his personal support to Buttrick's position, claiming that previous non-Christian marriages in the College chapel had "occurred without authorization."

Buttrick and Pusey are completely sincere in their conclusions, which follow from their Presbyterian premises. There is some difficulty, however—aside from theoretical objections to their stand—in reconciling their premises with the facts. For a few feet from Memorial Church—in Phillips Brooks House—Jews, Christian Scientists, and other religious groups regularly hold religious services "under the same roof." PBH apparently is fostering "intellectual dishonesty."

Even more disconcerting is the unquestionable fact that the dominant religious tradition at Harvard has been that of the Unitarian Church. But the Unitarians are not recognized as Christians by the leading Protestant-Christian group, the National Council of Churches (of which Buttrick's own group, the Presbyterians, are members). Indeed, a large part of the Unitarians' own annual meeting last summer was devoted to the question whether they should continue to call themselves Christians. Yet Buttrick would certainly not deny Unitarians the use of Memorial Church. Nor indeed would he set up tests to spot non-Jewish atheists who might wish a Christian service in the Church. The objection, apparently, is not to non-Christians, but to Jews. A strange logic? Yes, but *credo quia absurdum.*

These events—and numerous other happenings which faculty members will discuss "off the cuff" but not for publication—are only the surface rumblings of a wide division of opinion among faculty and administrative officers concerning the place of religion in higher education. The discussion centers over two main topics in educational theory: "the role of the committed man as teacher," and "religion as a unifying force in the curriculum."

Taking a stand on the first of these problems in his 1954-55 *Annual Report*, President Pusey argued:

> In view of this changing attitude toward religion it becomes even more important that the subject be given expert attention within the university by scholars of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"It would be intellectually dishonest for Christian and Jewish marriages to be carried on beneath the same roof. The Hebrew Community should build themselves a synagogue near the Yard. I will contribute the first $100." THE REV. GEORGE A. BUTTRICK.

> the highest competence *who can study theology fully because they do so as committed men.*

In his systematic theology, Paul Tillich has lent support to this opinion that a value-system or religion can be "fully" appreciated only by those who are committed to it. His viewpoint can be illustrated by passages from his recent book, *Dynamics of Faith*. In one discussion, he claims that

> All speaking about divine matters which is not done in the state of ultimate concern is meaningless . . . that which is meant in the act of faith cannot be approached in any other way than through an act of faith.

The view is elaborated as follows:

> The assertion that something has sacred character is meaningful only for the asserting faith. . . . The outside observer can only state that there is a correlation of faith between the one who has faith and the sacramental object of his faith. But he cannot deny or affirm the validity of this correlation of faith. He can only state it as a fact. . . . There is no criterion by which faith can be judged from outside the correlation of faith.

Whatever the theological merits of this doctrine, one has to rub one's eyes when he finds Paul Tillich embracing it. For Tillich, clearly failing to practice what he preaches, contradicts himself by his own example. The Professor, who is himself in one state of "ultimate concern," repeatedly criticizes — in this book and in many others — such other ultimate concerns as success, nationalism, totalitarianism, and traditional literal religion, even though his remarks on these topics are, by *his* definition, "meaningless." In talking about ultimate concerns other than his own, Tillich hardly stops at stating that certain correlations of faith exist. He evaluates them, labels many of them idolatrous, and denies many of them "validity" in his sense of that word: as expressive of "the ultimate which is really ultimate." Perhaps Tillich should have written, "The outside observer cannot deny or affirm the validity of this correlation of faith. He can only state it as a fact—*unless he embraces my system.*" This is a big order—even for a Harvard Professor and "the greatest theologian of our age."

Morton White, professor of Philosophy, has made the most penetrating and vigorous attack on the Pusey-Tillich position on commitment. At a speech at Hillel House—reprinted last fall in the Harvard Summer School Journal, *Confluence*—White stated,

> There have been great Catholic students of Catholic theology and great non-Catholic students of it. There have been great Protestant students of Jewish theology. There have been great Jewish students of Catholic theology. All of the permutations can be illustrated. . . . A scholar and teacher must insist that it is possible to understand a statement without accepting it, to understand a style of literature without admiring it, to understand the motives of Napoleon, Caesar or Stalin without praising them.

Jewish philosopher Henry A. Wolfson, Nathan Littauer Professor of Hebrew Literature and Philosophy, and Sir Hamilton A. R. Gibb, University Professor and non-Mohammedan student of Islam, are certainly exceptions which disprove the Pusey-Tillich rule. Wolfson's recent Harvard University Press work on the philosophy of the Christian patristics, for instance, was awarded the Harvard Faculty Prize last year.

Spiritual Mobilization

Hottest debate, however, has centered around the second problem: the efficacy of religion as a unifying force in the curriculum. As noted above, President Pusey began the debate in his Divinity Convocation speech.

This address followed a pattern which has become familiar in post-World War II sermons, wherein the existence of Evil, once the churchman's biggest problem, becomes his greatest argumentative asset. In such sermons, one's attention is called to the dividedness and misery of the present world. Next, some theory which does not emphasize the existence of such misery and woe is described and criticized. Then it is pointed out that "Christianity has always recognized the dual nature of man and the existence of sin in the world." And finally, acceptance of Christianity and abandonment of the alternate theory is urged as the answer to the evil—whatever the evil, the theory, or the interpretation of Christianity happens to be.

This kind of argument has great rhetorical effect: there is nothing like Evil—described in a really lurid way with statistics on suicides, war tolls, mental hospital enrollment, and ICBM blasting power (with a few thousand lost golf balls and asphalt roads thrown in for good measure)—to set the mood for the acceptance of a *non sequitur*.

Referring to the address Eliot had given at the closing session of the 1909 Harvard Summer School of Theology, President Pusey characterized Eliot as a believer in a "religion that placed its greatest reliance on increased

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

knowledge and good works." Eliot's faith, Pusey continued, "will not do for us, if for no other reason, because events of the 20th Century have made its easy optimism unpalatable." President Pusey's conclusion was that

> It is leadership in religious knowledge, and even more, in religious experience—not increased industrial might, not more research facilities, certainly not these things by themselves—of which we now have a most gaping need.

This argument is reminiscent of the technique of theologians like Reinhold Niebuhr, who tend to categorize most early 20th Century social theorists as "children of light," completely blinded by a doctrine of inevitable progress.

The Varieties of Faith

Without denying that there were in fact some such "children of light," one must disagree with President Pusey's conclusion that President Eliot was one of them. For Eliot referred specifically to "war times" and humanity's "brutal or savage instincts." He stressed in his speech that

> The new religion will not teach that character is likely to be suddenly changed. . . .
>
> Every age, barbarous or civilized, happy or unhappy, improving or degenerating, frames its own conception of God within the limits of its own experiences and imaginings. In this sense . . . a human religion has to wait for a humane generation. . . . We are today so profoundly dissatisfied with human justice, although it is the result of centuries of experience of social good and ill in this world, that we may well distrust human capacity to conceive of the justice of a morally perfect, infinite being. . . .
>
> Although [Eliot warns], brave and patient endurance of evil is always admirable and generally happier than timid or impatient conduct under suffering or wrong, it must be admitted that endurance or constancy is not consolation, and that there are many physical and mental disabilities for which there is no consolation in a literal sense. Human skill may mitigate or palliate some of them, human sympathy and kindness may make them more bearable, but neither religion nor philosophy offers any complete consolation for them, or ever has.

Finally Eliot asks, "Will such a religion as this make progress in the 20th Century world?" His answer is

> The new religion will . . . make but slow progress. . . . Whether it will prove as efficient to deter men from doing wrong and to encourage them to do right as the prevailing religions have been, is a question which only experience can answer.

This statement is simply not the opinion of the "easy optimist" and prophet of inevitable progress whom President Pusey describes. The President has, at least, badly misread his predecessor's speech. Perhaps it is President Pusey who is the optimist if he thinks a more realistic appraisal is likely to issue from the Divinity School.

The result of such latter-day optimism is to expect help on the "Big Questions," the "ultimate questions," and on "values" from only one kind of contemporary thinker: the flashy existentialist or teutonic theologian who ministers to the "Big Questions" with big answers and bigger "systems." The final, somewhat pathetic inference is that those few sober men who go about deflating these full-blown "Answers" are somehow perverse creatures "who fiddle while Rome burns" instead of making—with President Pusey—a radically new "soul-size" step in Christopher Fry's "exploration into God."

Many people accused Harvard of just fiddling in the years preceding the Pusey Administration. The University was represented frequently as secular, and therefore amoral, if not downright immoral. Nowhere is this reasoning better demonstrated than in the widespread misinterpretation of the Harvard Report of 1945 on *General Education in a Free Society*.

During its discussion of an ideal curriculum, the Harvard Report had stated, " . . . given the American scene with its varieties of faith and even of unfaith, we did not feel justified in proposing religious instruction as a part of the curriculum." As the Student Council Report on *Religion at Harvard* astutely pointed out last year, this statement in no way meant that Conant's committee thought that instruction about religious subjects and problems had no place in the curriculum. Making use of a distinction between "instructing in" and "instructing about," or between "preaching" and "teaching," the point of the Harvard Report was that "instruction in" or "preaching" of a certain religious dogma has no place in the curriculum of a free university. Elsewhere in the report the importance of studying *about* Christianity was emphasized. Nonetheless dozens of articles and books, including College of Wooster President Howard Lowry's *The Mind's Adventure,* and William F. Buckley, Jr.'s, *God and Man at Yale*, have vigorously attacked the report for "suggesting that the university omit instructions about an important part of the common heritage of humanity."

One of the co-authors of the Harvard Report, Raphael Demos, Alford Professor of Natural Religion, Moral Philosophy and Civil Polity, has amplified his views on the place of "values" in education in two *Alumni Bulletin* articles printed since the report.

Arguing that the basis of moral character is freedom of choice and that one can be said to be good only if he has freely chosen to do the good, Demos writes,

> At Harvard, of course, we make no effort to indoctrinate. . . . Rather, we try here to spread before the mind's eye of the student the various viewpoints and values so

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"President Eliot's faith will not do for us. . . . It is leadership in religious knowledge . . . of which we now have a most gaping need . . . The whole world now looks to us for a creed to believe and a song to sing."
PRESIDENT NATHAN MARSH PUSEY.

that he may make his own choices among them. Monolithic education is as bad as monolithic government. . . .

Some of us teachers believe in taking the student to the woods and losing him there; the process by which the student finds his way back constitutes his education. But in the process he may get confused and baffled; there is no good education without some suffering.

Demos—although he does not say this in his article—puts this theory into practice in his tutorial sessions. He usually introduces his tutees to philosophy with a highly rigorous discussion like G. E. Moore's *Principia Ethica.* When the student complains—as he usually does—about "silly hair-splitting," Demos immediately agrees with his pupil, drops the Moore and assigns one of the popular "philosophical" panaceas, like Tillich's *The Courage to Be.* The student usually gets the point. After exposure to Moore's searching intellect, he is no longer satisfied by easy inferences.

Demos argues:

To educate the intellect is to teach a person to think in accordance with reason, irrespective of his wishes and prejudices; it is to pass from wishful thinking to rational thinking. *But what else is character than control of the passions by reason?* . . . Risk and insecurity will be with us always. . . . Evil gives way slowly, if at all. We must not be utopian, insisting on everything or nothing. At the same time, we must be sure to keep our standards clear in our minds, never yielding to self-deception, never romanticizing what we cannot avoid, never calling evil good just because we have to live with it.

Is this not a realistic and value-centered statement? And is it not in just the spirit of President Pusey's often-expressed desire for a "deep personal confrontation" of values by Harvard students?

One of the first departmental shifts after President Pusey's election, however, was to put a professor with a profoundly different view of education in a special liaison post of teaching both in the Divinity School and in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. This teacher, John D. Wild, Professor of Philosophy, speaking at a 1956 conference at the School of Education, attributed the troubles of the West and "the crisis in the university" to the West's lack of a monolithic educational structure similar to that of the Soviets. Such a structure in the West, Wild argued, "is the most desperate need of our time."

Claiming that the great contemporary world cultures such as that of the USSR "are guided by overarching patterns of religious and philosophic thought which are cultivated in their schools, and which elicit voluntary devotion," Wild calls attention to the roots of the Russian culture in the Hegelian philosophy.

This semi-religious philosophy has been corrected and refined by several generations of thinkers, including Marx and Lenin. At the present time it includes fundamental ontology based on evidence accessible to all which can give an intelligible account of the results of the different sciences, a philosophy of man and human history which takes account of many facts, an ethics which claims to be grounded in the dialectic laws of nature, and a penetrating analysis of class conflict which has already offered unequivocal guidance for social action, and which has a profound appeal to many scientific minds, and to millions of oppressed people all over the world. Hence it is no accident that this integrating culture is far more formidable than any other now confronting us. The view of the world which binds it together is taught as a compulsory subject in every Russian high-school as well as in every technical school and university.

What do we have in the West corresponding to this great overarching structure of ideas? What integrating view of the world now guides our Western life and policy? . . . There is none!

One might challenge Professor Wild's statement on many grounds, beginning by wondering about this "compulsory subject" which elicits "voluntary devotion." Such criticism is, however, unnecessary. The important point is that the statement is by a Harvard professor, and that it is a particularly excited expression of a point of view one encounters repeatedly in current Christian discussions of the place of religion in higher education: in Moberly's *Crisis in the University;* in Henry P. Van Dusen's *God in Education;* in Howard Lowry's *The Mind's Adventure;* in T. S. Eliot's *The Idea of a Christian Society;* and most recently in the Kent School Symposium on the *Idea of a Christian Education.*

Whose Song Is Sung?

This view, broadly stated, is that the only way to destroy the Western Tower of Babel, its self-doubt, hesitation, lack of effective communication, anxiety, and disagreement, is for the West to have what President Pusey called a "A Song to Sing," an ideology as comprehensive and uniform as that of the Communists, in this case: Christianity. Only a few advocates of this view actually suggest Communist-type enforcement of their "overarch-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing faith." Certainly Wild does not. Others, however, are more extreme. One example of such a theory in practice is a statement Father John Courtney Murray made at the Kent School Symposium:

> We have the older students in the college and the university. Shouldn't it be possible to make an impact upon their imaginations with the humanities and with Christian doctrine in such wise that we would as it were, immunize them from the impact of the scientific experience?

Students would also be immunized, apparently from the disintegrating effects of intelligent reflection and searching examination. Moberly, for instance, writes, "In Europe amoralism is widely prevalent; and our own abler young men will accept nothing from tradition without searching examination. We academic people are too little awake to this disintegration. . . . "

There are two questions involved in the Wild-type proposals: Does the West need a common faith in its battle with Communism? And if so, is this faith Christianity? It is difficult to answer the second question affirmatively. Granted that Christianity comprises the greatest body of inherited and "living" wisdom in existence, granted even that it does in some sense contain "the truth," any contemporary expression of it raises more problems than it solves. There are too many different Christianities—even at Harvard Divinity School—for Christianity to act as a system on which Western men might practically agree today, whatever its unifying power half a millenium ago. Prospects for a future Christian synthesis, moreover, are far from bright. The greatest of those who are "trying to bring it up to date," Paul Tillich, is regarded as a heretic by many others who wish to return it to fundamentalism or Thomism.

Diversity and Tolerance

An approach toward an answer to the first question is found in the writings of President Conant. In his recent book, *The Citadel of Learning*, Conant gives a critique of Soviet Education which serves almost as a point by point rebuttal of the kind of theory Professor Wild espouses.

No one, Conant notes, "uses the word 'unity' more frequently than those who are attempting to force the Soviet ideology on the people of the Russian Zone." Their educational syllogism, he states, is "Education is concerned with truth, truth is everywhere the same, therefore education should be everywhere the same." Pointing up pernicious effects of such a doctrine in practice, such as the Lysenko case, Conant argues that to the degree that a scientist or scholar is dedicated to the advancement of learning as such, his ambition must be to contribute to a long-range human enterprise, not to an immediate undertaking or battle. "If anyone in the free world believes that a unifying philosophy is a goal to be desired at whatever price," Conant suggests, "then he should drive from the free sectors of Berlin eastward through the Brandenburg Gate."

These words "at whatever price" should be underscored in passing. For the recent Christian educational philosophers apparently *are* willing to "unify" the curriculum "at whatever price." So distinguished a Christian educator as President Henry P. Van Dusen, of Union Theological Seminary, a charter member of Princeton University's Board of Trustees, has written:

> Instructors might protest that, if they were adequately to teach their several subjects in conformity to the basic premise of the Unity of Truth, they would be compelled to recast the underlying structure of their minds. To which it might be replied, perhaps that is just what is required, if they are to fulfill their central loyalty to Truth.

It is important to notice that Conant's disagreement with such advocates of a "unifying philosophy" is no denial of the West's need for a minimal "common faith." Conant, however, locates the West's faith in a "wide diversity of beliefs and the tolerance of this diversity," identifying this diversity as the "bedrock to which our national unity was anchored." This agreement to disagree is part of Conant's answer to "those who think we have no basic answer to the challenge of the Soviet or fascist view of life," who "attempt to prove that we are spiritually bankrupt as a nation, and then offer to make us solvent by a free gift of their own particular set of dogmas."

"The moral basis of our culture," Conant argues, also rests on

> the dual postulate of the sacrosanct nature of the individual and the duty of each person to do unto others as he would have others do unto him. . . . Whether Protestant, Catholic, or Jew, active church member or nonconformist, almost every American believes that human life is sacred. This fact is the answer to those Cassandras who would have us believe that there is no spiritual unity in the United States.

This "spiritual unity" which Conant finds in the large agreement among religious groups as to the "ideal behavior" of an American citizen bears a marked resemblance to the "minimum" faith of Eliot's "religion of the future"; "love and service to one's neighbor" and war against "the evils which afflict humanity no matter what their real or imagined origin, or their present formidableness."

The difference between the faith of Conant and Demos and the faith of thinkers like Wild is the difference between what some political philosophers call a "procedural faith" and a "substantive faith." If a democracy—as many political theorists have argued—is committed

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"If anyone in the free world believes that a unifying philosophy is a goal to be desired at whatever price, then he should drive from the free sectors of Berlin eastward through the Brandenburg Gate."
PRESIDENT EMERITUS JAMES BYANT CONANT.

only to a procedural faith, one of making the conditions for free expression and disagreement possible, those who argue that democracy should embrace a value orthodoxy *in order to survive* contradict themselves. What they truly urge is that democracy be abandoned.

It is one thing, of course, to have a theory, and quite another to put that theory into practice. No one who has read President Pusey's splendid Baccalaureate addresses, or who has watched with admiration his strong stand against Senator McCarthy and others who wished to impose a kind of political orthodoxy on the University need fear that he intends to foster a religious orthodoxy at Harvard.

Still, theories have a habit of showing up in practice. They can do so quite perniciously when one's guard is down—as, for instance, at PBH, or in the Memorial Church regulation concerning Jewish marriages. What a splendid place Memorial Church might have been for Harvard men to collaborate in articulating their shared religious aspirations. What a fine symbol for their reaffirmation of a concern for those religious creeds and ways which are, in President Pusey's own words, "records of human experience at its very deepest levels of meaning." Instead, the fiat of a Presbyterian preacher—which is held to have something to do with "intellectual honesty"—forbids 25 percent of the student body from marrying beneath the college chapel's roof.

Pusey, Buttrick, Tillich, and Wild perhaps are right: we may suffer from too much doubt. But we may suffer more because too many are too sure of themselves.

There are many yellow-brick roads from doubt's greyness to the Land of Oz; and not all are paved with fool's gold. Not the least of these roads is taken by those who in a sense free themselves from their problems by trying to get a better understanding of what those problems are, by analyzing endlessly until they know in detail what is wrong with other answers even though they find no exciting solutions of their own.

Lately, however, it has become fashionable to ridicule such dry and analytical philosophers who deflate the wind bags of our time instead of blowing up more themselves.

Professor Morton White has well expressed the flavor of these frequent criticisms in his *Alumni Bulletin* article last fall on "Harvard's Philosophical Heritage." "What has happened to Philosophy at Harvard?" White asks with mock rhetoric. "Where is the Alpine splendor of Royce's absolute idealism, the playful practicality of James, and the literate Latin naturalism of Santayana? All melted away! And what do we see now but a wasteland of linguistic analysis, a verbal desert, a dusty retreat without even a Whitehead to blow the metaphysical bugle or cover the stark logistics with clouds of wisdom? Such might be the extreme reaction of a hostile, nostalgic critic of contemporary American philosophy."

The extreme reaction of at least one such hostile critic was much more blunt. "Some of the bums in Harvard Square who spend their time putting the toucherino in the passing crowd," wrote the editor of *I.E.* (the Cambridge review), in 1956, "are more philosophers than those professors in the Philosophy Department."

Perhaps. But perhaps some of those who insistently offer answers to the "Big Questions" in their lecture halls are also "putting the toucherino on the passing crowd."

The Courage To Think

Some Harvard men—and they are not solely in the Philosophy Department—will continue to urge, with White, that "a big question need not call for a big or pompous answer, as the dialogues of Plato show." Sharing with White "the conviction that the main instrument of philosophy is careful reasoning, and that therefore even those who deal seriously with theological problems" should "resist the notion that they can be solved in a cheap and misleading way," these men will "spurn the irrationalism and the double-talk which can so often confuse the central questions of philosophy and theology" and will therefore "share a common platform with each other even when they cannot accept each other's conclusions."

Believing, with White, that "a dull uniformity of doctrine can kill the spirit of philosophical investigation," they will encourage the "great tradition of reasonable difference and rational debate."

These Harvard men, like Demos, will continue to take their students to the woods, hoping that some, at least, will be educated in the process of finding their way out.

This article is a report from one student who is still deep in the woods, who sees no prospect of early escape, and whom others may therefore regard as lost. He prefers to think that he has found at least a part of himself there and that he will not be lost totally until—for the sake of Professor Tillich's Courage to Be—he loses the Courage to Think.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS & COMMENT

Hepcats to Hipsters

by William Raymond Smith

THERE has been so much confusion published by and about the San Francisco vanguardists recently that one begins to think San Francisco is the home for dead cats. Is it possible that the public has caught up with the vanguard of the arts? Reading Allen Ginsberg in *Life* and listening to David Rose's version of the "Swinging Shepherd Blues" on the cool cats afternoon show might lead one to think so. But the San Franciscans are not new. Mr. Ginsberg is not new in his crosscountry research for epigrams drawn from gas-station latrine walls. The love of the vanguard for low life is older than Villon who belonged to the 15th Century French equivalent of the Mafia. Sexual debauchery and dope addiction are much older than Rimbaud and Verlaine. However the A-bomb changed attitudes, and if one wants to understand the hipsters, and this group certainly includes more than the Frisco coterie, and perhaps does not include them at all, one has to go back a good many years before the first atomic chain reaction.

The original hipsters worked their way up the Mississippi on river boats from New Orleans. These cats were Negro boys, like Louis Armstrong, who got into and stayed out of trouble while playing their horns to earn a buck. They learned that women, wine and song were freer in Chicago, along with the green stuff, and few of them went home, at least for good. Though they set the language of jazz, the Negroes didn't retain exclusive control for long. The Chicago jazz school sprang up among a group of white boys, and other parts of the country caught on, until today, we have the west and east coast cool and all temperatures in between across the country. But it was the Negro, the big city Negro from Chicago and Harlem, who continued to set the jazz pattern, and the character of the hipster who goes along with the music. Mez Mezzro, an early Chicago-school white boy, tried to get back to the real New Orleans by becoming a Negro and selling tea on the street corners of Harlem during the depression.

THE WAR brought a few changes to jazz with Mr. Kenton and the progressive school, and after the war the country learned about bop. In the early fifties groups on the two coasts started playing a more sophisticated form of jazz which we learned was cool. The cool school lost the spontaneity of the old New Orleans type but gained restraint and intellectual appeal. During this time another kind of Negro music, rhythm and blues, was fused with an older type of American music, hillbilly, and the mid-fifties were appalled by rock and roll.

While the music developed, there was a corresponding development in the character of the hipster. Originally, hipsters were only found in Bronzeville and Harlem; but as jazz became more popular the hip attitude spread to the suburbs and high-schoolers learned the language, somewhat inaccurately, while devoting themselves to radio stations like WGES in Chicago which played rhythm and blues and occasionally other forms of jazz. The hipster language, like jazz, was a response of the Negro to the desire for expression in an ofay world. Ofays are the whites, and the word simply means foes. Cut off from a lot of things in New Orleans, Armstrong and others—Armstrong is a convenient example because he has written a book about his early life—got their kicks from talking with their horns. They learned to express a range of emotion from the deep sadness of the Negro spiritual to the elation of having a good woman and plenty of gin. They also learned to express themselves in a word-jazz which confused the ofay. The word-jazz developed into a code language as these musicians came north to Chicago.

It is important for any code language to change continually so that those naturally without it can't get with it. The word hip, meaning simply "know," used to be hep but when the hepcats of the thirties became notorious the word was changed. Code languages have always been a characteristic of the subordinate groups in society: Children have a language of their own which they do not intend their parents to understand. Furthermore, the dominant group rarely wishes to understand the subordinate group.

It should surprise no one that jazz and the hipster came into the larger American society from a subordinate social group. We used to hear that economics operates on a trickle *down* theory: some aspects of culture operate on a trickle *up* theory. The vanguard is, and always has been, in love with low life, few refuse to read Villon's "Ballade des Pendus" because the poet was once under sentence to be hanged. Marlowe is no less a playwright because he associated with criminals. It has even become the fashion to think that only those who know low life know life.

BUT it is not the low life that shocks some of us about the hipsters, it is their frankly anti-social attitude. The ideal of the musicians up from New Orleans was the cat. The cat is an animal going its own way, allowing itself to be petted, but when tired of the affection not tied to it. The cat is a creature of the night, getting its kicks while the master sleeps and occasionally waking the master when it howls too loud. The domestic cat exists to a large degree on the dole of the master and must play it cool, not scratching the furniture too much. The cat lives by its wits, appearing to know everything that happens by observing, digging, everything. The Negro took the attitude of the cat for his own.

Since the jazz men could not get their kicks in the accepted manner of the dominant white society, they found their own way outside of that society. They put themselves into a gone state with their music. Those around them were sent with the music, and alcohol, and tea, and sometimes something stronger. Playing night after night the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

musicians found that tea and whiskey were not enough for the pace and some had recourse to bennie and other narcotics. To be gone is to be in a state where life has a meaning beyond the cracked plaster and plugged toilet. To go is to try and get yourself sent into a state where you can find a way out of a shoddy existence.

Besides seeing visions and dreaming dreams the musicians get their kicks by fooling the white society. They fool them in their music and they fool them in their words. A few years ago one of the top songs on the juke box circuit was "Honey Love." To those in the know, the hipsters, it was a gas to hear "Honey Love" blasting from the radios and juke boxes in nice little suburban towns. Finally someone must have been clued in that honey love was a practice one didn't talk about in polite society and was outlawed in several states.

It seems only natural that those whites who felt themselves out of the society should adopt what they could understand of hip attitudes for their own. The adolescent has always felt himself out of the society. Some adolescents compensate for this feeling by aping the manners of their elders; some develop a world of their own. At this particular time a large group of adolescents seem to have adopted the attitudes of another group also out of society, the Negro.

The white man has always regarded the Negro as a child, and it is because the Negro is out of society that he is a child. Those who grew up during the great depression, the great war, and the hot peace were not able to understand society and felt out of it. All those in this age group do not adopt the hip attitude; but I am concerned with those who do, and by doing so continue to be considered by others, to be out of society. But society, for the hipster, is all wrong anyway; what society thinks is no matter, what society does is the matter.

Just as the Negro felt that there was no way out of the limitations placed on him by the white society except in jazz and jokes, so the adolescent feels that there is no way out of the military service, the rule of senile men, and the lack of means to be heard that plagues him except by adopting the hip attitude. It does not pay to get all shook up about things over which he has no control anyway. If he stands up and speaks his mind on what is wrong with the way his elders are handling things he is put down. "If these dead cats are going to blow it up, then the hell with it man. I mean, I'll get my kicks while I can. Life gets shorter every day, I mean, man, the only worth while thing is in myself. Anything else is a drag," says the hipster. The Charley Starkweathers and the Allen Ginsbergs want to go, man, go, but they don't know where they're going or how; and they don't recognize that if there's going to be trouble they are the ones who are going to get hurt. They pick up miseries like a crow picks up trinkets.

Another group, like Armstrong and the New Orleans boys, are trying to find something of worth out of their miserable lives. This group is characterized, like all hipsters, by an inarticulateness of expression in language. They continually rephrase what they say: "You're nowhere, man, like I mean, you don't know, I mean, you don't know why." Unlike the faddish hipster, they are trying for exactitude. This leads to a great deal of fumbling and bumbling but occasionally a right phrase is sweated out.

In music this attempt for exactness is expressed by people like Gerry Mulligan. Mulligan and his group take old show tunes and work counter-rhythm and harmonies into them. It does not always work but when it does they form from an old cliché something original and beautiful. In putting life into old tunes, Mulligan is doing the same thing that jazz has done since the New Or-

Arkansas

WHAT is it that we need, demand,
Between the rise and setting of a life?
Why can we not, content, drink
From the dew on seaward pines, rejoice in beauty,
Self-contained, of thoughtless mountains,
Soothe our hearts with love-taps of a lake's
Slow ripples on the shore? I sit
Upon the rocks and stare at schoolrooms I
Have never seen. Eight children, ringed
By stalwart hate, eat their dry fears alone
And wipe too late the Christian spit
From off their shoulders. Not one hand of those
Cowed hundreds goes out in comfort to
The cornered few. Not one voice batters through
To speak the shame that sickens me.

The tide laps at my feet. Pressed back
On history and nudged on now to take
A firm look at the future, I see
The insolent wrongs extend, various, rich,
Along the sordid years, and there's
No end, the pattern changing but the stench
The same. Let come the cleansing tide
And wipe each generation from this earth.
The next onrushing wave will leave
Its trash upon the beach, its maddened men,
But with this knowledge: they will be
Drowned in their age, swept out to nothingness.
The good go with them; that's a loss.
But the price perhaps is not too high to pay
For a barren strand, a moment when
The towers of arrogance, mined, betrayed,
Eroded by the foam, collapse
And stream out to their fate, drawn under by
The hungry undertow of time.

BEVERLEY M. BOWIE

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

leans days. But where the New Orleans jazz was wild and unrestrained, Mulligan is cool and formal.

Literature is not directly connected with the development of the hipster or with jazz. So far the only writing that has really come out of jazz has been slight and for the most part autobiographical — Armstrong and Mezzro were both represented on the news stands by pocket books. But the formal nature of Mulligan's music is reflected in the best verse written by poets born after 1930. These poets are for the most part unknown and unpublished in the name journals and slicks. Melvin Walker La Follette, a young poet born in Indiana in 1930, has published some of the best verse of these younger men. La Follette does not write in the hipster's language and his verse is quite articulate; he does not have to write notes for his poems, his verse is poetry and not pedantry. "The Blue Horse," published in *The New Poets of England and America*, expresses an attitude common among those whose childhood was spent during the great depression and the war. The blue horse "tamed us with his eager love—/We killed him with our feeble fear."

It is wrong to say that the attitude of the hipster is imported from France no matter how many similarities there may be between an existentialist and a hipster. The hipster is an American product just as jazz is an American product. It is perverse not to take pride in a type of music that has captured the imagination of the world, just as it is not to hope the direction toward which artists like Mulligan and La Follette point will become the dominant pattern of American art. If the artist is in any sense a prophet, may we not hope that creating a form out of the chaos that surrounds our lives may play an increasing role in the future of the species?

How the Press Uses its Freedom

by Harvey Swados

THE SUBTITLE of this book, by a journalist familiar to readers of this journal, is: An Inquiry into Freedom of the Press. But in truth it ranges considerably further than the subtitle would indicate: it is an examination of the American situation with particular reference to the current status and influence of American journalism, by an observer who is by turns disenchanted without being easily cynical, and an optimist without being a Pollyanna. It would be "fatuous" to assume that some mysterious substance in the democratic air has protected us forever from tyrants —and yet "we have established a political system that has now outlasted all others that existed in 1789. . . . " Mr. Johnson takes this as presumptive proof of the wisdom and foresight of James Madison, who had posited the existence of large contending factions as safeguarding the democracy and stability of the republic.

Peril and Promise, by Gerald W. Johnson (Harper; $2.75).

This kind of equilibrium theory is not novel, but it is characteristic of Mr. Johnson to disclaim any attempt at originality, the while he puts the theory to work by demonstrating how useful it can be in examining the dialectic of paradox in the newspaper business. If the newspaper "extra" has been rendered obsolete by the radio news flash and the daily paper has been weakened in other ways by the advent of the smiling TV newscaster, the position of the press has also been strengthened with regard to these rivals by its uniqueness as a medium of permanent record. If advertising uses the press to pump the public full of lies, it also produces a most sophisticated public. If the press has come to be the voice of Big Business, the public has come to realize this and to discount the advice of the press accordingly even while regarding it as a quasi-public utility. If industrialists make notoriously poor journalists, journalists make poor politicians.

But Mr. Johnson does far more than playfully juxtapose opposites. He does not see the opposing forces as merely cancelling one another out, or automatically creating a harmonious balance. "So it works down to this," he says,

> . . . freedom of expression, which is inseparable from freedom of opinion, will inevitably disappear unless there is a strong and insistent demand for it; and there will be no strong and insistent public demand unless freedom of expression is obviously valuable to the public. A freedom that is enjoyed by nobody in town except one newspaper publisher is of small value to anybody else and will not be vigorously defended by the public. It is my belief that unless the great majority of those publishers who have attained a monopoly accept the responsibility that goes with monopoly there will be some form of political interference with freedom of the press within the next ten years.

This stimulating little volume is remarkably free from cant and from the exhausted lingo of the pundits who pass off other people's notions as their own with guff about battling for the minds and hearts of men and the Free Press of the Free World battling against the Kept Press of the Slave World. It is salty, direct, and sparkling with insights not only into the world of journalism which Gerald Johnson knows as few others do, but also into that larger world which is a compound of the title of his newest work. When he points out that the American people have a gift, not only for quick recovery from such viral infections as McCarthyism, but also for blandly denying that they were ever infected at all, we knew that we are meeting a man who knows the American people as well as he loves them.

Books in Brief

***The London Shakespeare*, edited by John Munro, six volumes (Simon and Schuster; $30)**

HERE'S a chance to replace Grandpa's stodgily illustrated Victorian set of Shakespeare that has so long been magnetizing dust in a corner of the parlor. These six new volumes of the complete works are easy on the eye, cozy in the hand, and by today's prices not too rough on the pocketbook. The editor, John Munro, was an authority on English texts who died recently at 73. He accepted many of the standard emendations, including Theobald's "a babbled

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of green fields," yet he was modern enough to adopt Dover Wilson's reading of "sullied flesh" for what Grandpa used to get as Hamlet's "solid flesh." Sometimes, particularly in *Richard III*, Munro provocatively had some original ideas in this field where every man is his own editor—of the "true" text.

It's easier to quarrel with some of Munro's editorial devices such as accent stress. While marking the *-ed* endings that have to be sounded in Shakespeare, why didn't he indicate the other kinds of necessary "mispronunciations"? In a set aimed at parlor readers, the verse should have road signs to keep it on the highway.

More seriously, the textual notes to these volumes are wrongly placed: at the bottom of each page. The notes themselves are excellent, making this edition a miniature variorum, but they are of interest primarily to scholars and should be at the end of each play or volume. And the publishers could have saved a lot of space, however, by leaving out W. G. W. Wickham's pleasant but unnecessary General Introduction. But these are secondary objections in the face of a large accomplishment: after all, when the plays and characters are so good and the dialogue so often first rate, why complain if the settings and the costumes aren't altogether perfect?

HARRY T. MOORE

•

***Year of Crisis: Communist Propaganda Activities in 1956*, edited by Evron Kirkpatrick (Macmillan; $5.50).**

IN THIS second study, following an earlier volume for 1955, Dr. Kirkpatrick once again combines country-by-country factual surveys with separate chapters on worldwide Communist propaganda themes and the nature of Communist propaganda media. With their rich documentation and detail, the surveys by country remain the most useful part of the book. There can be debate on some of the interpretations advanced in the general chapters, but the facts speak for themselves in the country surveys and have been assembled for ready reference. Here is the authoritative text, for example, on Soviet radio broadcasts in Arabic and Communist Chinese-subsidized journals in, say, India or Indonesia.

S. S. H.

MOVIES

The Dispossessed

RECENTLY there appeared a book, called *Novel Into Film*, which set out to examine the process by which a work of fiction is converted to little images on a strip of celluloid. The author, George Bluestone, did not address himself to the question of whether or not this transformation is a good idea, but he went very thoroughly into his own motion of how it ought to be done, and how best to appreciate the finished product. It is a mistake, for example, to go to an adaptation in the expectation that it will bear any resemblance to the book. You will only be disappointed, for sticking to the text is not the adaptor's job. His function is to be "a new author in his own right," a function which allows him to remain totally ignorant of the original text. For, Dr. Bluestone tells us, "we often find that the film adaptor has not even read the book, that he has depended instead on a paraphrase by his secretary or his screen writer."

The Brothers Karamazov (MGM).

"Under these circumstances," he cheerfully admits, "we should not be surprised to find a long list of discontented novelists." But, "what has not been sufficiently realized is that . . . destruction [of the novel] is inevitable. In the fullest sense of the word, the filmist becomes not a translator for an established author, but a new author in his own right."

These remarks were very much on my mind as I watched a current adaptation, by John Brooks and Julius J. and Phillip G. Epstein, of a well known work by Feodor Dostoevsky. In its new form, *The Brothers Karamazov*, is the story of a bald young man (Yul Brynner) who should have been a night-club owner in Casablanca, but instead has the misfortune to be stuck in a small town in Russia, where all his suavity is wasted, and his attempts to relieve the tedium only bring him to grief. One of his pastimes is to pick fights with his father (Lee J. Cobb), a very disagreeable old man, who likes to tie girls to beds and tickle their feet.

The disputes, however, are about some money which Dmitri (as the hero is called) feels is coming to him, but which Mr. Karamazov hasn't the least intention of parting with. Also participating in these bouts are Dmitri's three brothers: Alyosha (William Slater), Ivan (Richard Basehart) and Smerdyakov (Albert Salmi). The latter is a bastard son and rather addled at that, so no one pays much attention to him, except the camera, which is constantly focusing on him, from a variety of unflattering angles. Later we learn the reason for this. Alyosha is a priggish young man, dressed in the cassock of a Russian monk (though he resembles nothing so much as a homesick midwestern boy in his first year at the Harvard Divinity School), whose contribution to the proceedings is to purse his lips and give voice to such lines as: "Dmitri, we all need love," or "You *don't* believe in God? Well I feel very sorry for you." The remaining brother, Ivan, is an intellectual. He is given a number of clever things to say ("Can't we be civilized about this?") and in one instance he is even allowed to claim a line of Voltaire's for his own. "If there were no God," he declares, and pauses for effect, "he would have to be invented." Everyone gasps with admiration.

Presently Dmitri gets himself involved with a local beauty named Grushenka (Maria Schell), in spite of the fact that he is already engaged to a lady named Katya (Claire Bloom). Grushenka, although unmistakably mad about Dmitri, plays coy, which annoys him and leads him, finally, to suppose that she means to accept the elder Karamazov's invitation to come and let him practice his podiatry on her.

Meanwhile back at the house, Smerdyakov is busy planning to murder the old man. His idea is that nobody, except the audience, should know that he did it, and accordingly, he arranges things so that the evidence will point to Dmitri. All happens according to plan and Dmitri is duly arrested and charged with parricide.

At the trial, things go badly for him. Dmitri is convicted and sentenced to hard labor. But since it would hardly

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The New Republic
announces a competition
for younger writers.

$1000 in awards

for

The best essays on the state of American fiction — considered in general or in terms of a single younger novelist.

The best essays on any aspect of present-day television — viewed as a medium for enlightenment or entertainment.

●

If you are under 27 you are eligible for this competition.

●

10 awards of $100 each
5 in each of the two categories

●

We are looking for writers who are already good but not yet famous.

Essays should be 1500-3000 words in length. Manuscripts will be judged by the editors of *The New Republic*. Return postage should be enclosed.

Submit manuscripts by October 1, 1958, to

Awards Department
The New Republic
1244 - 19th St., N.W.
Washington 6, D. C.

to send such a handsome fellow to Siberia, a thrilling last minute escape is successfully negotiated. As the film ends, the lovers are seen arranging blankets in the back seat of a closed carriage which is carrying them across the border, to a quieter locale perhaps, where the sound-truck doesn't reflect so deafeningly of someone's preoccupation with the Russian Easter Overture.

What Dr. Bluestone termed "the mutational process" has evidently taken place. A great book has been transformed into a great bore. Under the circumstances, a comparison between the two "artistic entities" would hardly be fair, to Mr. Brooks or the Epsteins. It could be asked, however, why the adaptors did not dispense with the novel altogether. This would have saved them a lot of work, and spared them much nagging criticism by reviewers who had not taken the trouble to read Dr. Bluestone's book.

JANET WINN

ART

From Darkness to Light

TWO EVENTS this year have focused attention on Abraham Rattner. Had the events been totally irrelevant to his painting, the attention would still have been a good thing because Rattner is in the very top group of American artists now producing important work based on a lifetime of growth and achievement and, due to his twenty years residence in France and the peculiar distortions in the glass of fashion since his return, this is not nearly as widely recognized as it ought to be.

As it happens, both events carried a certain significance beyond their primary importance as exhibitions. In New York, Rattner had his first exhibition at Edith Halpert's Downtown Gallery. Whatever the circumstances of departure and arrival, it is most appropriate for an American painter of Rattner's quality to be represented by Mrs. Halpert. Perhaps more than any dealer, she is responsible for the acceptance of American painting by American collectors. At any rate she's worked at it hard and honestly for thirty years with a success attested not only by the vast improvement in the overall situation but by the "spin-offs" whereby whole new galleries have been established with painters she found, by the distinction of such Downtown regulars as Stuart Davis, Arthur Dove, Yasuo Kuniyoshi, Georgia O'Keeffe, and Ben Shahn, and by such an embarrassment of riches as her recent Charles Sheeler exhibition. Edith Halpert's quest has been for an American greatness in art. She has it again in Abraham Rattner.

In Washington the Corcoran Gallery presented a Rattner show in what seems an odd combination with Alexander Calder. The oddness was apparently recognized by the Gallery in the installation, which treated the event as two separate shows going on at once rather than playing painting against mobile. This was certainly wise yet there is a common quality and it must have been perceived by the Gallery in its original conception. Rattner and Calder share a spiritual purity, an innocence which is not often found in life at large, let alone in art. The innocence of Calder is the innocence we like to attribute to children. The innocence of Rattner is a different thing. It is the innocence of a saint who has arrived at his sanctity carrying with him the whole human experience. The slowly turning leaves on Calder's mobiles are from a tree in Eden; we watch them for themselves alone and easily fall into the trance worked by waves on sand, a stream shattered by rocks, or, for that matter, leaves themselves turned by the breeze to take the sun. The flame and shadow in Rattner's paint come from a later period in our collective or individual lives. The way out from Eden is marked by certain

Coming

Two Studies in Scientific Atheism

by Robert Graves

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Until some unmistakable portent comes along, such as Nixon's resigning his office and going to Africa as a missionary, common sense requires the hypothesis that he has not changed."

●

MARGARET HALSEY'S article in the January 13 issue of *The New Republic*—"Beware the Tender Trap"—has aroused nationwide discussion

●

Reprints Now Available

Single copy 10 cents
10 copies 75 cents
25 copies $1.50
50 copies $2.50

●

THE NEW REPUBLIC
1244 19th St. N. W.
Washington 6, D. C.

as many as half a dozen have been reversed.

The Rosenberg case to which you advert is indeed excellent evidence of the high quality of his performance. Never in the history of the United States has any case received a greater number of re-examinations and more intensive scrutiny. Among the judges of the Court of Appeals and of the United States Supreme Court who reviewed this case were included the foremost champions of human liberty.

Only once has a judgment by Judge Kaufman been reversed by the United States Supreme Court, and that, by a 5-to-4 Court. You would be well instructed to examine that case which is entitled *United States ex rel Mezei v. Shaughnessy*, 345 U.S. 206, decided in 1953. There he stood with the minority, on the side of those who would give greater protection to the immigrant.

Apparently, you took no note at the fact that his voice has been heard, more frequently and more insistently than that of any other judge, exhorting lawyers to take unpopular causes.

Apparently, you took no note at all of his public advocacy of respect for the Fifth Amendment, nor of the circumstance that he presented this view not before audiences composed of members of the Civil Liberties Union, but before conventions of the American Legion.

Manifestly you are unaware of the fact that his contributions to the science of jurisprudence have received publication in the foremost legal journals of the United States.

Nor have you taken notice of his important contribution to the administration of justice in the solution of the problem of calendar congestion. His performance in that area alone has evoked wide attention in many judicial circuits throughout the country, and thereupon the Chief Justice appointed him to the Committee of the Judicial Conference on Pre-Trial Procedures.

Although there can be no honest difference of opinion about the guilt of the Rosenbergs, I am quite prepared to agree that reasonable men may differ about the sentence. Neither President Truman, nor President Eisenhower, saw fit to interfere, although they had the required power. However, you are entitled to a different view. Does such a difference justify disapproval of a judicial promotion? What would you say were a judge denied promotion because a judgment pronounced by him failed to win the concurrence of a McCarthy or a Jenner? To suggest that a judge's opinion is to be appraised by a popularity meter is dangerous doctrine in a constitutional democracy.

SIMON H. RIFKIND

New York, N. Y.

THE QUALITY of judicial performance is of course one of that happy multiplicity of things—including even the guilt of the Rosenbergs—on which opinions may fairly and honestly differ. Mr. Rifkind is able to adduce nothing out of the ordinary to the credit of Judge Kaufman, unless it be a propensity for extra-judicial speech-making, and it is at least doubtful which side of the ledger that belongs on. Mr. Rifkind is not applying to Judge Kaufman the standards that were evident in his own work as a district judge. By those necessarily high standards, Judge Rifkind, as was universally acknowledged, stood in the front rank, and Judge Kaufman, as we have said, is undistinguished, save by the deplorable error of the death sentence in the Rosenberg case, now to be perversely celebrated in his promotion.

The Rosenberg case, incidentally, was never reviewed by the Supreme Court of the United States. That court, on the contrary, declined to review it. The case had two full reviews on separate issues (other than the sentence, which was effectively unreviewable) in the Court of Appeals. In the course of the second one, Judge Swan, writing for the court, remarked that the trial was marred by "wholly reprehensible" misbehavior on the part of the US Attorney, and that it would have been proper, had defendants entered a timely objection, to declare a mistrial.

THE EDITORS

► *Erratum (NR, April 14)*

PRAISE the rhymes astute and various
of minor poet Sagittarius.
Bemoan no less the hidden mystery
of where in hell he learned his history.
Adams, H., was not a President
or even State Department resident.
Sag, old boy, can you convince me
you never heard the name John Quincy?

LOUIS PELLETIER

Pawling, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

subjects: Moses, the prophets, the valley of dry bones, the pillar of cloud by day, of flame by night, the faith of Job, Christ's dying, Christ dead and down from the Cross. To these ancient religious themes, Rattner brings a vision shaped by our time. He also develops purely contemporary themes of his own which, not from association, but from inner intensity take on the same religious and even mystical meaning which he perceives as new and vital in the so often mindlessly repeated Biblical materials. The root trouble with the overwhelming majority of what passes for religious art as nowhere stated so brilliantly as in the Bible itself: "Not everyone who says, 'Lord, Lord!' shall enter the kingdom." Rattner never says "Lord, Lord" but he paints as one from birth a citizen of the kingdom.

Appropriately enough, my own most recent experience of Rattner's painting was in a suburban Chicago synagogue which, rather astonishingly, having decided to "branch out" from displays of members' home-made art, opened its new program with a very substantial Rattner's exhibition with pictures from the Corcoran show, from the Downtown Gallery and from a number of Chicago collectors.

There was a "Moses" there that is a particularly fine example of Rattner's two-edged achievement in bringing to life materials long thought dead and, at the same time, bringing the highest range of the human spirit into a method of painting that so far has been largely determinedly materialistic.

Perhaps the most significant value of recent American painting has been the sometimes starry-eyed discovery of paint itself, the material, the thickness of it, the weight of it and the brilliance of pure color, as well as the rhythm of painting, no longer the secret discoverable by the trained eye alone but the inescapable impression on the most casual observer. Rattner takes all of this and uses it as the means of realizing his vision, in very much the way that drawing was used by authentic artists in an older tradition of painting.

The basic structure in "Moses" is one Rattner often uses, a dynamic progress from dark to light, with each thick stroke of paint itself repeating in miniature the dark to light movement of the painting. From the dark pole in the upper left, Moses himself in the desert, the flux of paint moves down and around in a great curve, something to draw along the very sands of the desert, or the very soul of the captives in Egypt. Thrusting up on the right side, still turning as we look from dark to light, the flux reaches a climax of brightness and rhythm in a sudden burst of thinly painted, sharp strokes like tongues of flame. They are tongues of flame and they are also a flowing Hebrew script, "Shema Yisroel Adonai Elohenu Adonai Echod,"—"Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God, the Lord is One."

Rattner's choice of the burning bush reminds us that prior to the Renaissance lawgiver and military chief, Moses is a mystic in direct communion with God, that the Law itself is both predicated upon and intended to lead to the knowledge of God. If the charm of Calder's world is that it exists somehow before the moral life, the soaring strength of Rattner's is that it moves beyond the moral life, achieving in a leap of recognition what morality plods toward step by step.

FRANK GETLEIN

Notes on Contributors

WILLIAM RAYMOND SMITH is a graduate student at the University of Chicago; this is his first published essay. HARVEY SWADOS has written two novels: *Out Went the Candle* and *On the Line*. HARRY T. MOORE is on the faculty of Southern Illinois University.

Correspondence

(Continued from page 3)

what is wrong with your editorial. You have not collected the relevant facts. Those who know the facts say there is nothing wrong with such a promotion.

A search for the facts would have disclosed to you that in the opinion of lawyers who practice in the Federal Court, and in the opinion of the Appellate Courts who review his work, and he is rated as quite a superior judge. The Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit has found innumerable occasions to commend and applaud his judicial craftsmanship. He has probably written as many as five hundred opinions. Not

EUROPE
Summer 1958—9 weeks
We'll see the usual, plus North Africa, Yugoslavia, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Berlin, and Denmark. A low priced, different kind of trip for the young in spirit who don't want to be herded around.
EUROPE SUMMER TOURS
255 Sequoia (Box N)
Pasadena, Calif.

AUTHORS WANTED BY N. Y. PUBLISHER
New York, N. Y.—One of the nation's largest book publishers is seeking manuscripts of all types—fiction, non-fiction, poetry. Special attention to new writers. If your work is ready for publication, send for booklet RP—*it's free.* Vantage Press, 120 W. 31st St., New York 1. (Midwest Office: 220 So. Michigan Ave., Chicago 4, Ill.)

REGISTER NOW
at
CAMP KINDERLAND
Hopewell Junction, N. Y. (Sylvan Lake)
GIRLS AND BOYS AGES 6-16)
2, 4, 6 and 8 week periods available
Moderate Rates. Full Program of Land and Water Sports, Arts, Crafts, Singing, Dancing and Dramatics.
A Children's camp combining Jewish culture with interracial living.
New York Offices:
1 Union Square West, N.Y.C.
Tel: Algonquin 5-6283

SPECIAL ISSUE ON INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION, Current Issue of **ETC: A REVIEW OF GENERAL SEMANTICS** edited by S. I. Hayakawa, featuring Margaret Mead, Edmund Glenn, Henry Lee Smith, Clyde Kluckhohn, F. P. Kilpatrick. Price $1.00. Issue free with subscription order $4.00 a year. Write **Dept. 22, 400 West North Avenue, Chicago 10, Illinois.**

HISTORY TEACHER, bachelor, 25. Craves summer employment involving world travel, M.S. 3131 Bagley, Apt. 1, Los Angeles 34, California.

SIGNS HAND CARVED ON HEAVY OAK. 3" letter, Perpetua type, $1.35; Old English, $1.75. Wm. W. Wallace, R#1, Tryon, N. C.

BRITISH SHOES FOR GENTLEMEN at a fraction of their American retail price! $10.95 includes duty and import charges. Delivery in ten days from receipt of order. Unconditional money-back guarantee. Write for free illustrated catalogue. Steven Williams, Jr., Ltd., 40 Chatham Road, Short Hills, New Jersey.

CLASSIFIED RATES
Per word (single insertion) 12c
Per word 6 times in one contract year 11c
Per word 13 times in one contract year 10c
Per word 26 times in one contract year 9c
Per word 52 times in one contract year 8c
NEW REPUBLIC
1244 Nineteenth St. N.W., Wash. 6, D.C.

PRINTED BY NATIONAL PUBLISHING CO., 301 N ST., N. E., WASHINGTON 2, D. C.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED